

a conveying device for collecting the first signatures and the second signatures from the first folder and the second folder.

32. (New) The printing device as recited in claim 31 wherein the printing press includes a longitudinal slitter for slitting a web into the printed rolls.

33. (New) The printing device as recited in claim 31 wherein the first folder exits the first signatures in a first direction, and the second folder exits the second signatures in a second direction parallel to the first direction, and the conveying device has a conveying direction perpendicular to the first and second directions.

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 and 27 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Petersen. Claims 6 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Hermach. Claims 9 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Welborn.

Claims 27 to 29 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 31 to 33 have been added.

Claims 1 to 5 and 27 to 29

Claims 1 to 5 and 27 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Petersen. Claims 27 to 29 have been canceled.

Richards discloses a web-up device in which a web-up system 8 has a web-up mechanism 4 and a ribbon winder 6. During make-ready, each ribbon 7 is fed through the web-up mechanism. While two of the ribbons, for example 7.1 and 7.2, are being wound up by winder 6, the third ribbon 7.3 is cut by an operator and fed through the press via roller 500. Once ribbon 7.3 is fed through, ribbon 7.2 is cut and fed through, and then ribbon 7.1 is cut and fed through. The ribbon wrapped up on rollers 420, 421 is excess waste and discarded. See col. 4, lines 18 to 35.

Petersen discloses a web-fed printing press with a single folder for producing a single stream of signatures.

Claim 1 recites a printing device comprising:

“a roll-to roll printing press for forming a plurality of printed rolls; and
a separate assembly device, the assembly device having a plurality of roll unwinding devices separate from the printing press, a first folder accepting at least one first web from the roll unwinding devices and forming first signatures, and a second folder accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures.”

It is respectfully submitted that Richards does not disclose a roll-to-roll printing press for forming a plurality of printed rolls. Richards is a standard printing press in which wind-up device is used at make-ready to feed, and does not create a plurality of printed rolls for further processing. Richards thus is not a roll-to-roll printing press, as during printing the web of Richards goes from a roll directly to the folder without winding up on another roll. The rolled up ribbons are discarded.

It is therefore also respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Petersen with the standard press of Richards. In addition, the asserted motivation to alter Richards, it is respectfully submitted, is not valid, as Richards does not unwind rolls to send to a folder at all.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Petersen does not disclose a second folder, as asserted at the last line of page 1 of the office action. In fact, in discussing Petersen later with respect to claims 6 to 8, the office action specifically states “Petersen et al. does not teach a second folder.”

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have found it obvious to modify Petersen to provide “a second folder accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures” as claimed in claim 1. Petersen accepts all webs from its rolls prior to the cutting device and combines the web before making a first and sole set of signatures. Adding a second folder forming separate second signatures to Petersen adds complexity and it is not understood how it would speed up signature formation as asserted in the office action, as all the webs are combined at the same speed.

The present invention has at least two folders that form two separate streams of signatures that are then collected on a conveyor. This two-folder structure permits more flexibility with the rolls and combinations of signatures. Neither Petersen nor Richards recognizes this advantage

and neither forms first and second signatures using two folders as claimed in claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 to 5.

With further respect to claim 4, it is respectfully submitted that no conveying device for collecting separate first and second signatures is disclosed in the cited prior art.

Claims 6 to 11

Claims 6 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Hermach. Claims 9 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Hermach.

Petersen is discussed above.

Hermach shows a single folder creating one stream of signatures, and having several former boards 26.

Claim 6 recites an assembly device for assembling printed rolls of material comprising:
a plurality of roll unwinding device;

a first folder accepting at least one first web from the roll unwinding devices and forming first signatures; and

a second folder accepting at least one second web from the roll unwinding devices and forming second signatures.

Claim 6 requires "a first folder ...forming first signatures" and "a second folder ...forming second signatures."

Thus as defined by the present application, the each of the first and second folders must cut the web into signatures, which are defined length pieces cut from a web.

Both Petersen and Hermach first combine webs over at least one former board and bring the webs together before they are cut. Thus, neither Petersen nor Hermach discloses "a second folder... forming second signatures" as claimed in claim 6. Each discloses forming only first signatures from a single folder.

Claims 9 to 11 depend from claim 6 and Wellborn as well does not show a second folder.

In addition, with respect to claim 10, Wellborn does not disclose a conveyor for collecting signatures from two separate folders.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 6 to 11 is also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No fee is believed required. If any fee is required at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:


William C. Gehris

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as "first class mail" with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to "Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231" on January 23, 2003.

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

BY:


Christina Colocotronis

Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018